

Response

Applicant: John M. Hall et al.

Serial No.: 09/810,074

Filed: March 15, 2004

Docket No.: 10004376-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS
IN A COMPUTER NETWORK

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed August 5, 2004. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 12, and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biliris et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0009107 ("Biliris") in view of Dieterman, U.S. Patent No. 6,393,464 ("Dieterman"). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biliris in view of Dieterman, and further in view of Arnold, U.S. Patent No. 6,275,848 ("Arnold"). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biliris in view of Dieterman, and further in view of Shaw et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,247,045 ("Shaw"). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biliris in view of Dieterman, and further in view of Joseph et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,415 ("Joseph").

With this Response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-21. Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 12, and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biliris et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0009107 ("Biliris") in view of Dieterman, U.S. Patent No. 6,393,464 ("Dieterman"). Independent claim 1 includes the limitation "determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory." With respect to claim 1, the Examiner acknowledged that "Biliris fails to teach determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory." (Office Action at para. no. 8, page 3). The Examiner stated that "Dieterman teaches determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory (Fig. 3 block 33; col. 4, lines 31-38; directory includes all company addresses, addresses found in directory

Response

Applicant: John M. Hall et al.

Serial No.: 09/810,074

Filed: March 15, 2004

Docket No.: 10004376-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS
IN A COMPUTER NETWORK

are internal).” (Office Action at para. no. 9, page 3). Block 33 in Figure 3 of Dieterman states “Recipient in Allowed List?”. Dieterman at column 4, lines 31-38, discloses that:

If the (sic) all of the recipients are on the allowed list, step 33, the email message is placed in the normal mail outbox, step 34. When the next connection with the ISP is made, step 35, all messages in the normal mail outbox are sent onto the internet, step 37.

If, however, when performing the comparison between each named recipient and the contents of the allowed list it is determined that not all recipients are in fact on the allowed list, step 33, then the email message is placed in an alternate outbox designated for messages that require administrator approval before being sent, step 38. (Dieterman at col. 4, lines 31-41).

As shown above, the cited portions of Dieterman include no teaching or suggestion regarding determining whether a network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to a company. There is no teaching or suggestion in Dieterman that “directory includes all company addresses, addresses found in directory are internal”, as suggested by the Examiner. There is no teaching or suggestion in Dieterman that the “allowed list” is a list of all addresses of a company. Rather, Dieterman is directed to providing “a method by which parents can allow their children to use a computer connected to the internet while simultaneously controlling the audience with whom the child communicates.” (Dieterman at col. 1, lines 45-50). Dieterman discloses that the “allowed list” is a list of allowed senders and recipients, which is specified by a parent or guardian. (Dieterman at col. 3, lines 34-44). Dieterman does not teach or suggest “determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory”, as recited in independent claim 1.

In view of the above, independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Biliris and Dieterman, either alone, or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 2-9 and 12 further define patentably distinct claim 1, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, claims 2-9 and 12 are believed to be allowable over

Response

Applicant: John M. Hall et al.

Serial No.: 09/810,074

Filed: March 15, 2004

Docket No.: 10004376-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS
IN A COMPUTER NETWORK

the cited prior art. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 2-9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of these claims.

Independent claim 15 includes the limitation “a controller configured to perform a search of the directory server based on the received destination information and determine whether the destination information specifies a destination that is internal to a first company based on the search.” The Examiner stated that “[a]s per claim 15, claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.” (Office Action at para. no. 29, page 7). As described above with respect to claim 1, Biliris and Dieterman do not teach or suggest “determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory”, as recited in claim 1. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Biliris and Dieterman also do not teach or suggest “a controller configured to perform a search of the directory server based on the received destination information and determine whether the destination information specifies a destination that is internal to a first company based on the search”, as recited in independent claim 15.

In view of the above, independent claim 15 is not taught or suggested by Biliris and Dieterman, either alone, or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 16 and 17 further define patentably distinct claim 15, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, claims 16 and 17 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of these claims.

Independent claim 18 includes the limitation “determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory”. The Examiner stated that “[c]laim 18 is rejected for the same reason as claim 1.” (Office Action at para. no. 32, page 8). As described above with respect to claim 1, Biliris and Dieterman do not teach or suggest “determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company

Response

Applicant: John M. Hall et al.

Serial No.: 09/810,074

Filed: March 15, 2004

Docket No.: 10004376-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS
IN A COMPUTER NETWORK

directory”, as recited in claim 1. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Biliris and Dieterman also do not teach or suggest this limitation in independent claim 18.

In view of the above, independent claim 18 is not taught or suggested by Biliris and Dieterman, either alone, or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 19-21 further define patentably distinct claim 1, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, claims 19-21 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biliris in view of Dieterman, and further in view of Arnold, U.S. Patent No. 6,275,848 (“Arnold”). Claims 10 and 11 are dependent on independent claim 1. As described above with respect to claim 1, Biliris and Dieterman do not teach or suggest “determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory”, as recited in claim 1. Arnold also does not teach or suggest this limitation of claim 1. In view of the above, since dependent claims 10 and 11 further define patentably distinct claim 1, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, claims 10 and 11 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biliris in view of Dieterman, and further in view of Shaw et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,247,045 (“Shaw”). Claim 13 is dependent on independent claim 1. As described above with respect to claim 1, Biliris and Dieterman do not teach or suggest “determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory”, as recited in claim 1. Shaw also does not teach or suggest this limitation of claim 1. In view of the above, since dependent claim 13 further defines patentably distinct claim 1, and is further distinguishable over the cited references, claim 13 is believed to be allowable

Response

Applicant: John M. Hall et al.

Serial No.: 09/810,074

Filed: March 15, 2004

Docket No.: 10004376-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS
IN A COMPUTER NETWORK

over the cited prior art. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim.

The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biliris in view of Dieterman, and further in view of Joseph et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,415 ("Joseph"). Claim 14 is dependent on independent claim 1. As described above with respect to claim 1, Biliris and Dieterman do not teach or suggest "determining whether the first network communication is directed to a destination that is internal to the company based on the comparison of the received destination information and the information in the company directory", as recited in claim 1. Joseph also does not teach or suggest this limitation of claim 1. In view of the above, since dependent claim 14 further defines patentably distinct claim 1, and is further distinguishable over the cited references, claim 14 is believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-21 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-21 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)(c). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either James R. McDaniel at Telephone No. (208) 396-4095, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Jeff A. Holmen at Telephone No. (612) 573-0178, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Response

Applicant: John M. Hall et al.

Serial No.: 09/810,074

Filed: March 15, 2004

Docket No.: 10004376-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS
IN A COMPUTER NETWORK

Hewlett-Packard Company

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Hall et al.

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-0178

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 10/28/04

JAH:jmc

Jeff A. Holmen
Jeff A. Holmen

Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 28th day of October, 2004.

By Jeff A. Holmen

Name: Jeff A. Holmen